1	In accord with both Toyota's offer and this Court's Order No. 11: Schedulin		
2	("To submit a list of three to five bellwether cases from which the initial trials wi		
3	be drawn no later than April 21, 2011"), Plaintiffs agree to submit a list of fiv		
4	bellwether plaintiffs on April 21, 2011.		
5	Plaintiffs' proposal for bellwether trial selection is the plan offered by		
6	Toyota's counsel during the hearing on December 9, 2010:		
7	MR. JOEL SMITH: "In terms of selection, we think it's		
8	appropriate for the plaintiff to identify five cases, and we will		
9	pick one. We can pick one from their five. We believe the case		
10	selection is an easy thing for us to do, and it could be done by		
11	the time we have another hearing. We could work out		
12	hopefully on the front end these front-end things that we have		
13	got identified as happening early in the big orange arrow		
14	(Transcript of December 9, 2010 Hearing, 71:17-72:1) See		
15	Exhibit A.		
16	Bellwether selection details were further discussed in the same hearing, in		
17	dialogue between the Court and Mark Robinson, as follows:		
18	MR. MARK ROBINSON: Your Honor, I really think that first		
19	of all this chart is just crazy. I mean, they want to do the expert		
20	discovery on a Camry case in July of next year		
21	THE COURT: "Mr. Galvin suggests or Mr. Young suggests		
22	one or the other you pick the five. You pick them, and		
23	they will just take anything you put on the table.		
24	MR. MARK ROBINSON: Any of those 50 cases that are filed?		
25	They are nodding their heads, Your Honor. Well, that's a start.		
26	(Transcript of December 9, 2010 Hearing, 83:3-6; 83:21-84:2)		
27	See Exhibit A.		

Following this discussion of the bellwether selection process, Plaintiffs' counsel indicated agreement with Toyota's proposal:

MR. MARK ROBINSON: "I agree with their concept of letting us pick five bellwethers." (Transcript of December 9, 2010 Hearing, 85:23-24). *See Exhibit A*.

Toyota's statement that Plaintiffs can pick five cases and that Toyota will pick one of those five cases for trial did not narrow the bellwether selection criteria to only cases involving a Toyota Camry, or any other vehicle for that matter. In fact, the "big orange arrow" discussed by counsel during the hearing refers to Toyota's proposed schedule, and does not even mention the Toyota Camry.

Toyota's new proposal is a "bellwether vehicle" plan rather than a bellwether trial plan, and it self-servingly attempts to force Plaintiffs to select only Toyota Camry cases. Plaintiffs contend that it is inappropriate for Toyota to change their proposed bellwether selection process at this time. Fundamentally, it would be unfair to allow Toyota to direct Plaintiffs to pick five out of the fifty plus cases, and then pull a "bait-and-switch" just as Plaintiffs get close to selecting the five cases. Plaintiffs bought into this concept – "hook, line and sinker" – and it is not fair for Toyota to now claim that their counsel did not actually mean what he said on the record. This is especially true when Toyota's counsel all nodded and indicated that they agreed with Plaintiffs when selection from "[a]ny of those 50 cases that are filed" was discussed. (Transcript of December 9, 2010 Hearing, 83:24-84:2) *See Exhibit A*.

Per Toyota's original proposal, Plaintiffs agree to pick five bellwether plaintiffs on April 21, 2011, prior to fact discovery and before significant time and costs are expended on expert discovery. From that list of five bellwether plaintiffs, Toyota will be permitted to select one of those cases to be the first Personal Injury/Wrongful Death ("PI/WD") case to be tried. Also, in order to avoid delay and to ensure that an additional PI/WD bellwether trial is prepared to proceed,

Plaintiffs will allow Toyota to pick a second case (from the remaining list of four cases) to be the second PI/WD bellwether trial.

The Court has stated that it will decide whether an Economic Loss or a PI/WD case will be the first trial. Consequently, this proposal pertains only to the PI/WD bellwether plaintiffs.

Plaintiffs' above proposal is summarized as follows:

- Plaintiffs shall file and serve a list of five PI/WD bellwether plaintiffs on April 22, 2011;
- Fact discovery shall proceed on all five of the PI/WD bellwether plaintiffs' cases;
- After fact discovery is completed and before expert disclosures, Toyota will select one of the five PI/WD bellwether plaintiffs' cases for trial;
- Toyota will also have the right to pick the second bellwether plaintiffs' case for trial from the remaining four cases that Plaintiffs identify on April 22, 2011.

This approach will efficiently advance the litigation. While the parties are conducting fact discovery on the five bellwether cases and preparing the selected cases for trial, the Court will necessarily issue rulings that will inform how the remaining cases will be prosecuted.¹ Moreover, the ultimate resolution of the selected cases will inform the parties' litigation strategy on other cases. For these reasons, the Manual for Complex Litigation recommends prosecution of "test" or "bellwether" cases in mass tort litigation. Manual for Complex Litigation, § 22.315 (4th ed. 2004).

For these reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court enter Plaintiffs' Proposed Order Regarding Bellwether Selection.

- 3 -

27 28

912441.1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Plaintiffs propose that after the first two trials are completed, the Court may establish a process to decide which subsequent cases will be tried and in what order.

Case 8:10-ml-02151-JVS -FMO Document 768 Filed 02/22/11 Page 5 of 14 Page ID #:26807

1	Dated: February 22, 2011	ROBINSON, CALCAGNIE & ROBINSON
2		By: /s/ Mark P. Robinson, Jr.
3		Mark P. Robinson, Jr. (SBN 54426) mrobinson@rcrlaw.net
4 5		Scot D. Wilson (SBN 223367) swilson@rcrlaw.net PORINSON CALCAGNIE & PORINSON
6		620 Newport Center Drive, 7th Floor Newport Beach, CA, 92660
7		ROBINSON, CALCAGNIE & ROBINSON 620 Newport Center Drive, 7th Floor Newport Beach, CA 92660 Telephone: (949) 720-1288 Facsimile: (949) 720-1292
8		Elizabeth J. Cabraser (SBN 083151)
9		ecabraser@lchb.com Todd A. Walburg (SBN 213063)
10		twalburg@lchb.com 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone (415) 056 1000
11		Telephone: (415) 956-1000 Facsimile: (415) 956-1008
12		Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Liaison Counsel for the
13		Personal Injury/Wrongful Death Cases
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

EXHIBIT A

1 1 2 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 5 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 SOUTHERN DIVISION 7 THE HONORABLE JAMES V. SELNA, JUDGE PRESIDING 9 IN RE: TOYOTA MOTOR CORP. UNINTENDED 10 ACCELERATION MARKETING, 11 SALES PRACTICES, and PRODUCTS LIABILITY 12 ML 10-2151-JVS (FMOx) LITIGATION 13 14 15 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 16 17 Santa Ana, California December 9, 2010 18 19 20 SHARON A. SEFFENS, RPR United States Courthouse 21 411 West 4th Street, Suite 1-1053 Santa Ana, CA 92701 22 (714) 543-0870 23 24 25

SHARON SEFFENS, U.S. DISTRICT COURT REPORTER

MR. ROBINSON: That's what we have done. In terms of the chart I have just given you, we would like to stage things. We would like to have some limited case specific discovery. We want to get the defense fact sheets answered before we do these, for example, any depositions or limited interrogatories, et cetera, to the plaintiffs.

In terms of third-party discovery, I think we have all agreed we can do third-party discovery. We want to take -- if there are 51 dealers in these 51 cases, we want to take their depos immediately. I just think that is going to be something that we are going to be able to sit down and work out. We started discussing that on Monday, and we got off on the source code and other issues.

THE COURT: The showings the parties have made to me for this hearing indicate to me that you have had substantial discussions and ongoing discussions with regard to a number of issues: the format for production, search by documents or key words, and the source code issue. I want to see those resolved shortly, but I think we need to come back to the big picture for the moment.

Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.

May it please the Court, if I could just answer a question that you asked about selection of bellwether trials. We believe that it would be appropriate to have the

SHARON SEFFENS, U.S. DISTRICT COURT REPORTER

1.0

bellwether trials -- at least the first one and probably more than that tried by Your Honor. The benefit of the bellwether trial is not simply to allow us to get a case to trial or to know what the settlement values of cases are, but it also benefits the Court in having to go through one of these trials, to go through a 702 hearing, to see the details of the science because that is going to inform the Court about the larger orange arrow at the top of the page.

In this graph, what we have tried to represent are the four elements that we have tried to build into this, three which Mr. Young described. The fourth is really the plaintiffs' Phase II discovery plan, which is sort of front-end loaded as you can see in the first part of it.

What we are working on now with the plaintiffs is trying to build in an agreement on all of the features, some of which Mr. Robinson just mentioned, and there is ongoing discussion about that. It's been healthy and cordial and appropriate. We are trying to build that into the front end. I think I heard Your Honor say at the beginning of this portion of the hearing that that was something that you were looking for, the idea of getting that kind of core information up front. We are doing that, and that's part of where we are going with this.

The other three aspects are the sequence discovery, choosing -- and I think we are in agreement --

choosing the three vehicles that have been described and trying to get those on the front end of this, and then hopefully that will inform the Court.

-17

In terms of the bellwethers, up until today, there has not been an agreement that we would do bellwethers. We believe bellwethers need to be selected soon so that we can begin to gather full discovery. These bellwethers are about automobile accidents, events that are remembered by individual people, and those memories need to be preserved. We need to get to that as soon as possible with a full discovery — as if I had walked in your courtroom and filed a Complaint today, a sequence like this would be I think something consistent with Your Honor's prior rulings on schedules. Nothing about these cases and these crashes are different that should require those not to go forward. We agree with that.

In terms of selection, we think it's appropriate for the plaintiff to identify five cases, and we will pick one. We can pick one from their five. We believe the case selection is an easy thing for us to do, and it could be done by the time we have another hearing. We could work out hopefully on the front end these front-end things that we have got identified as happening early in the big orange arrow and having those things hopefully by the next hearing — to be able to come back to you with agreements on

source code and those kinds of things.

1.3

Up until today there has been no agreement to select beliwethers. Your Honor asked where we stand on this overall plan. What the plaintiffs have told us is that they are not in a position now to set any deadlines. We agree with Your Honor that it's absolutely appropriate now to set deadlines as if this were any other case and that we will work within those deadlines. The other thing that the plaintiff has said that it has not agreed to do is establish bellwethers now. Those have been the two sticking points that we have had up until now. I'm not really sure I understand how that all fits in this because there's not — I mean, it's on a roadway, but it's not sequenced and overlapping like we have tried to put it.

What we would hope Your Honor would tell us to do is to take something very close to the exhibit we provided -- Your Honor, we have actually provided one without any dates on the bottom in order to respect what Your Honor has said that -- we are not going to set Your Honor's deadlines. We will live with the deadlines that Your Honor sets -- but to fill in for the Court in this type of an exhibit the deadlines that are appropriate and to come to you in January with bellwether trials that we are ready to fully litigate, fully discover, on both sides experts, and proceed in that direction. We believe that those tools

aspirational which you will decide is reasonable or not.

THE COURT: Mr. Robinson.

MR. ROBINSON: Your Honor, I really think that first of all this chart is just crazy. I mean, they want to do the expert discovery on a Camry case in July of next year. The bottom line is --

THE COURT: That's seven months away.

MR. ROBINSON: We are not going to have the documents or the depos done for a good year. The way it's going right now I hope it's a year. I really do. One thing we learned from the Japanese language depositions is that we thought 11 hours would be good for a witness. It's going to take three days minimum for each of those witnesses. The way those questions and answers go you triple your time from an English-speaking depo to the Japanese language.

What I think is this. I like the bellwether process. We suggested it, but I think this, that really the bellwether trial should not -- the picks should not be done until the core discovery is complete. That just makes sense.

THE COURT: Mr. Galvin suggests or Mr. Young suggests -- one or the other -- you pick the five. You pick them, and they will just take anything you put on the table.

MR. ROBINSON: Any of those 50 cases that are

filed?

2.0

They are nodding their heads, Your Honor. Well, that's a start.

Here is the problem. The core discovery is necessary before we actually go to experts, and part of that core discovery -- I don't know if this is true, but Mr. Galvin told me that NASA on just the Camry alone -- I don't know what Camrys they looked at, but NASA has taken eight months to look at the source code, whatever they have been given.

THE COURT: Lawyers are much more motivated.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, Your Honor, if these people are willing to -- I really think -- what I am going to propose is this. If they want to do a rapid track, which I would like to do it in some ways, I think next week we ought to be ordered back here to discuss two issues with you. We should finalize the ESI issues. We may get that done, but we have to come back to you on the source code next week. I am telling you we have a major disagreement. I don't want to get into it, but we need to be able to come back on the source code.

If I see that we're -- for example, their suggestion is going to triple the time for our analysis on the source code. It will probably make it impossible for our expert to do it, but if we can get our suggestion on the source code, we can probably -- if they give us the source

code, I think we can get the source code analyzed maybe in six months at our laboratory, so that could be a big thing.

In the meantime, are they going to give us these documents, not just the Camry, ES, and Tacoma documents, but we need other documents because when you try an auto product case ---

THE COURT: I think they have acknowledged the necessity of producing the historical documents that would track the development from the mid '90s forward, so that you put in context the particular design features reflected in any of these three bellwether models.

MR. ROBINSON: But we don't know the timing on when they are going to give us these documents. We have had a good meet and confer this week, but we still don't know when we are going to get those documents. If these documents are being produced in the next 120 days, I think we can come back and maybe talk more on scheduling, because if we don't have the documents and we don't have the source code by then and our experts aren't analyzing the source code, then things are going to be delayed. If they are going to give us these documents right away, then I think we should come back here in 120 days and actually decide.

I agree with their concept of letting us pick five bellwethers. At that time, the Court can maybe make a better decision on whether the Court wants to try the class

SHARON SEFFENS, U.S. DISTRICT COURT REPORTER